

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 5-20 and 34 are pending; claims 1-3 and 5-13 are allowed; claims 14 and 18-21 are rejected; and claims 15-17 and 34 are objected to. Claim 21 is herein cancelled without prejudice. Claim 20 is amended to include the features of dependent claim 21. Applicants submit that the amendment should be allowed because it reduces the issues on appeal, should an appeal be taken. The reasons for rejection of claim 20 are now moot and instead only the previous rejection of claim 21 applies to (amended) claim 20.

Applicants herein assert that claims 14 and 18-19, which depend from independent claims 14, are patentable over Loboda (U.S. 6,268,262) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because Loboda fails to teach or suggest all features of independent claims 14. Loboda fails to teach or suggest that the airbridge has a second electrically insulative layer overlying the first electrically conductive layer. The Examiner contends that Loboda's element 13 is a second electrically insulative layer. Loboda's element 13 is silicon carbide, which is electrically conductive. (See column 4, lines 49-50 and the attaches two pages from Morgan Advanced Ceramics.) Loboda fails to teach or suggest any other material for element 13 and thus, Loboda fails to teach or suggest that element 13 is a second electrically insulative layer. Furthermore, there are no other layers overlying Loboda's first electrically conductive layer 12 and therefore, Loboda fails to teach or suggest an airbridge having an electrically insulative layer over an electrically conductive layer. For at least this reason, claim 14 and its dependencies (at least claims 18-19) are patentable over Loboda under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In addition, Applicants submit that Loboda and the knowledge of one skilled in the art fails to teach or suggest having a gap between an airbridge and an electrically insulative layer. Loboda teaches forming a gap over a semiconductor device, which may be a silicon based device. The Examiner contends that because Loboda teaches that a silicon based device (e.g., MOS device) can be used that the gap would be formed over a first insulative layer and that inherently an oxide cap layer would be the top-most layer of the MOS device and thus the gap would be between an airbridge and an electrically insulative layer. The Examiner's statement that MOS transistors commonly include oxide cap layers is without support. If this rejection is to be upheld Applicants request support for it.

Applicants herein assert that claim 20 is patentable over Loboda under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because Loboda fails to teach or suggest forming a first portion of an electrically insulative material (second layer) to form a second portion of an airbridge. As discussed above, Loboda's layer 13 is not electrically insulative (instead it is conductive). In other words, Loboda fails to

teach using any electrically insulative layer to form an airbridge. For at least this reason, claim 20 is also patentable over Loboda under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Believing to have responded to every issue raised by the Examiner in the last communication mailed, Applicants believe the present Application is currently in a condition of allowance. Applicants earnestly solicit allowance of all pending claims. Please contact Applicant's practitioner listed below if there are any issues.


Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By:



Kim-Marie Vo

Agent of Record

Reg. No.: 50,714

Telephone: (512) 996-6839

Fax No.: (512) 996-6854

Email: K.Vo@Motorola.com